

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

IN RE:

HandPicked, Inc.,

Debtor(s).

C/A No. 23-01923-EG

Chapter 11

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
JOINT ADMINISTRATION**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the Motion of the Debtors for Entry of an Order Directing Joint Administration of the Related Chapter 11 Cases (the “Motion”) filed by HandPicked, Inc. (“Debtor”) on June 30, 2023¹, seeking an order pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 1015(b) authorizing the joint administration of Debtor’s case with the case of Sonya M. Ingram and Kevin D. Ingram. (the “Ingrams”), Case No. 23-01924-eg. The Court conducted an emergency hearing on the Motion on July 11, 2023.

Mrs. Ingram is the owner of 100% of Debtor’s shares. In the Motion, Debtor seeks authority to jointly administer its case with that of the Ingrams pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1015(b), which provides, in relevant part:

If a joint petition or two or more petitions are pending in the same court by or against (1) spouses, or (2) a partnership and one or more of its general partners, or (3) two or more general partners, or (4) a debtor and an affiliate, the court *may* order a joint administration of the estates.

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1015(b) (emphasis added). The Motion makes clear that Debtor and the Ingrams are not seeking to have their cases substantively consolidated and emphasizes that the rights of creditors in each case will not be adversely affected by joint administration of the cases. *See* Motion at ¶¶ 8, 10. The Motion further seeks authorization for bankruptcy counsel and the Subchapter V Trustee to file fee applications and to charge fees as

¹ ECF No. 5.

though Debtor and the Ingrams are one and the same. The United States Trustee (“UST”) filed an objection to the Motion requesting that fees sought in either case be allocated to the correct debtor and that case specific services are set forth on billing statements attached to fee applications filed separately in each case. At the hearing, the parties indicated that the UST’s objection had been resolved. The Court, however, raised some concerns regarding the need for the relief sought. When questioned by the Court, Debtor’s counsel indicated that it was Debtor’s and the Ingrams’ intent to file a separate plan in their respective cases, proofs of claims would be filed against the estate of each respective debtor indebted to such creditor, and separate monthly operating reports would be filed in each case. The only benefit that was articulated for joint administration of the two cases was to have hearings in the two cases heard at the same time—something that can be accomplished through other means.


Motions to jointly administer cases are often granted in cases involving multiple debtors and often serve a useful purpose in increasing administrative efficiencies and preserving limited judicial resources. From an administrative efficiency standpoint, the Court is not convinced that under the facts of these cases, their joint administration would accomplish that purpose. Based on the record before the Court and for all reasons set forth herein and stated on the record at the hearing,

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Motion is DENIED.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

**FILED BY THE COURT
07/12/2023**




Elisabetta G. M. Gasparini
US Bankruptcy Judge
District of South Carolina

Entered: 07/12/2023